

THEOLOGICAL MONTHLY.

VOL. IV.

DECEMBER, 1924.

No. 12.

The Creed of Jesus.

JOHN THEODORE MUELLER, St. Louis, Mo.

Creed or Deed? — In a recent issue of the *Presbyterian* (July 31, 1924) the editor, under the heading, "Doctrines as Tests," touches upon a subject of vital present-day interest. He writes: —

"It is popular to decry doctrines as tests — whether the question, What is Christianity? or the question, *What is a Christian?* is under consideration. When a reason is given, it is usually to the effect that *doctrines are not essential to Christianity*. Some allege that Christianity consists of its facts rather than its doctrines, while others affirm that it is *life, not doctrines*. If either of these allegations is sound, it is evident that doctrines belong to that which is secondary rather than that which is primary to the Christian religion. If such is the case, the rejection of doctrinal tests merits universal approval. Unless doctrines enter into the very substance of Christianity, both as a system of thought and as a way of life, it is evident, to say the least, that doctrinal tests are inadequate.

"It is frequently said that Christianity consists of *its facts rather than its doctrines*. It is impossible, however, to have *the facts of Christianity* apart from its doctrines. Give up the doctrines, and at the same time we give up the facts. There is no sieve discoverable that will strain out the doctrines and save the facts. . . .

"It is frequently said that *Christianity is life, not doctrine*. What is meant is that doctrines are secondary in Christianity, that they are but the intellectual expression of the life that precedes them. From this point of view, doctrines are the products, rather than the producers, of the Christian life. As such they possess only a relative significance, and one set of doctrines may be as good as another. At any rate, the life is the one thing of vital importance, and as long as it flourishes, the doctrines may be allowed to take care of themselves."

The matter treated here is certainly one of weighty importance. Should doctrines serve as tests of one's Christianity? Can Christianity exist without profession of the specific Christian doctrines? Or can Christianity be built upon a code of ethics or upon deeds? The modern claim is that doctrines are not essential to Christianity. This claim is advanced not only by preachers and teachers of theology, but also by laymen. In fact, it is largely the laymen who to-day demand that Christianity be divorced from doctrine and based upon character and deeds. The following letter, addressed to one of the great newspapers of our country, is an illustration of this present-day tendency:—

"In the present controversy in religious circles there is a statement made by the so-called Fundamentalists which fails to ring true to thinking people. It is a statement which has been made in various forms by different clergymen, but the gist of it is that '*if Christianity is merely a code of ethics, it is useless and must collapse.*'"

"I fail to see the force of this. Religion is a force to guide our lives and conduct far more than it is a matter of theological belief. In the present day people are realizing as never before that it is *deed rather than creed* which should be emphasized.

"The Great Teacher *preached no theology*. He taught a code of ethics which has never been surpassed as a guide of life seven days in the week. According to Him the only things that counted were the love of God (*i. e.*, reverence for the higher things of life) and the brotherhood of man (*i. e.*, going about doing good). The great influence of Jesus as a moral and ethical Guide and Teacher lies not so much in whether He was a supernatural being as in the fact that He lived a life and set an example worthy of reverence and love from any one.

"There is no point in sitting down and bemoaning the fact that the young people will not go to church. The thing which must be done is to make *religion reasonable, logical, and sound*, and they will fill our churches. Not so long ago I attended a liberal church in New York, and as I went out, I heard two young men (evidently students) remarking that at last they had found a church that taught something they could believe and use. In this, it seems to me, lies the secret of workable religion. It is time to forget one-day creed and concentrate on seven-day deeds."

This letter is significant, as it presents the issue in clear terms. The author avers that in the present day people are realizing as never before that it is deeds rather than creeds which should be

emphasized. "The Great Teacher preached no theology. He taught a code of ethics which has never been surpassed as a guide of life seven days in the week. . . . The great influence of Jesus as a moral and ethical Guide and Teacher lies not so much in whether He was a supernatural being as in the fact that He lived a life and set an example worthy of reverence and love from any one." In these words the writer virtually demands that the doctrines and religious teachings of Christ be rejected, and that men be taught merely to follow the life of Jesus as the way to salvation.

In the introduction to a lecture entitled, "The Social Teaching of Jesus Christ," the writer, a prominent theological professor in our country, says: "Jesus of Nazareth is the supreme ethical authority. When we come to receive from Him our final awards, He will not ask, . . . 'What was your doctrine of atonement? What was your mode of baptism?' But He will ask, 'What did you do with Me? Did you accept Me as your personal standard of character? Were you a practical every-day Christian?' Christian ethics will be the judgment test."

This only repeats the thought stated above that "religion is a force to guide our lives and conduct far more than it is a matter of theological belief," and that "it is deed rather than creed which should be emphasized."

This Attitude a Total Denial of Christianity. — This attitude of Modernists towards Christ is in direct opposition to traditional Christianity. It is, in fact, a total denial of what believing Christians in the past have regarded as the essence of Christianity. It is a substitute for Christianity, as it puts in the place of Christ, the divine Savior of the world, a human Christ, a mere teacher of morals. For the salvation by faith in the vicarious atonement of the world's divine Redeemer, it substitutes salvation by work-righteousness. This is claimed to be a superior viewpoint. In this way Modernists would fill the churches — by making religion "reasonable, logical, and sound." In view of these facts it is necessary for believing Christians to take a firm stand and to point out the utter fallacy of this position. That Christ taught a code of ethics and emphasized holiness of life each day of the week, believing Christians readily admit. However, that such teaching of ethics was the real and primary purpose of Christ's coming means to misunderstand the entire Gospel of Christ's redemption. Christ did not come to teach a new code of ethics, but "to seek and to save that which was lost." Luke 19, 10. His preaching was

centered in the message of repentance and faith. Mark 1, 14, 15. The key-note of His Gospel was: "Repent ye and believe the Gospel." Mark 1, 15. So striking was the teaching of Jesus that all who heard Him were amazed and said, "What thing is this? What new doctrine is this?" Mark 1, 27. Christ was a Teacher of a specific theology, and His ethical teachings were but an illustration, and His miracles a corroboration, of His creed. A brief examination of His teachings proves this beyond controversy.

The Creed of Jesus. — The creed of Jesus involved, in the first place, His own person. In clear terms He acknowledges His deity. He is God's Son, John 3, 16, 17; the Christ, the Son of the living God, John 6, 69. He is one with the Father, John 10, 30, in one undivided and indivisible essence. He commands His disciples to baptize all nations in the name of the Father and of the Son and of the Holy Ghost. Matt. 28, 19. For Himself He demands acknowledgment of His deity and divine worship in the same sense as it is due to the Father. John 5, 23. This He requires because He is the living God in the same sense as the Father. John 5, 26. But Jesus acknowledges also the Holy Spirit as the one true God with the Father and Himself. Matt. 12, 31; for He is the Spirit of God, John 6, 63, who proceeds from the Father, John 14, 26, as well as from the Son, John 15, 26; 16, 7. Since Christ is one with the Father and the Holy Ghost, He claims for Himself not only unity of essence with the Father, but also unity of divine operation. John 5, 17. As the divine Christ, one with the Father and the Holy Ghost, of the same glory and majesty, Christ demands acceptance, worship, and homage of Himself and His Word. John 5, 23, 36, 37. He sharply rebukes those who do not accept His witness. John 5, 38. Those who do not accept this witness cannot have God for their Father. John 8, 42. They are of the devil, whose lusts they would do. John 8, 44. On the other hand, God's children hear God's Word, John 8, 47, and search the Scriptures to find Christ, John 5, 39. Thus we see that Christ had a very distinct creed concerning the true God, His own deity, and His divine message. He proclaimed in terms that admit of no doubt the worship of the Holy Trinity, faith in Him as the divine Savior, and acceptance of His Gospel as necessary for salvation. Only those who accept His Word have life. Mark 16, 15, 16. That men, despite this clear testimony of Christ claim that the great Master taught no theology is a proof of the dreadful perversion and apostasy of the present generation. John 8, 44; Matt. 24, 22—24.

However, Christ's creed also embraces the reality of *sin* and the plan of *salvation* from sin. To Christ the existence of a personal devil was an incontestable reality. John 8, 44. Satan and the perverted will of men are responsible for the woeful spiritual oppression under which man is held. Luke 8, 12. Born in sin and fettered by it, man cannot see the kingdom of God except he be born again of water and of the Spirit, John 3, 3—5; for that which is born of the flesh is flesh, v. 6. This new birth, the work of the Holy Spirit, consists in repentance and faith. Mark 1, 15. Only those who repent and believe on Him can worship God in Spirit and in truth. John 4, 24. 42. He, Christ, alone is the Way, the Truth, and the Life, so that no one can come unto the Father but by Him. John 14, 6. Faith in the Son is required. John 6, 40. Only to the believer in Christ are given the unqualified promises of salvation. John 5, 24. Thus Christ clearly taught the universality and damnable-ness of sin and the necessity of faith in Him, the divine Redeemer, as the only way of salvation. Those who deny this and teach salvation by "deeds" reject the very essence of Christ's Gospel.

As Christ taught salvation by grace through faith alone, so He also rejected the doctrine of work-righteousness. Man, being totally perverted by sin, cannot work out his own salvation. John 3, 6. No one can come to Christ except the Father which sent Him draw him. John 6, 44. If any man would come to Him, it must be given to him of His Father. John 6, 65. The self-righteous Pharisee, who trusted in his works and despised others, went down to his house unjustified. Luke 18, 14. All self-righteous Pharisees are blind guides, who strain at gnats and swallow camels; who make clean the outside of the cup and of the platter, but within are full of extortion and excess; who appear righteous unto men, but within are full of hypocrisy and iniquity. Matt. 23, 24—28. They are serpents, a generation of vipers, who cannot escape the damnation of hell. Matt. 23, 33. Rejecting Christ and building their hope of salvation upon work-righteousness, they will perish in their sins. John 8, 21. 24. In these words Christ most emphatically condemns the pharisaic doctrine of justification by works.

Since man is utterly lost, the purpose of Christ's coming was to work out for sinful mankind a sure and universal redemption and to invite sinners to partake of it freely. John 6, 51. He came into this world that sinners might have life, John 10, 10; 15, 13, giving His life for the sheep as the Good Shepherd, John 10, 11. Of Himself He laid down His life. John 10, 18. That was the

work which He had come to finish. John 4, 34. He must accomplish all things that are written by the prophets concerning the Son of Man, being delivered into the hands of the Gentiles, mocked, spitefully entreated, spitted upon, scourged, and put to death. Luke 18, 31—33. All this was accomplished on the cross, where He cried out with a shout of victory, "It is finished!" John 19, 30. Certainly Christ's creed embraced the vicarious atonement. Faith only in the Redeemer who died for man is the sinner's way of salvation. John 17, 3. To Him all that labor and are heavy laden must come for rest. Matt. 11, 28. Those who come to Him He will in no wise cast out. John 6, 37.

Again, the creed of Christ contains clear statements on the efficacy of the means of grace. All nations are to be baptized, made disciples, by *baptism* in the name of the Father and of the Son and of the Holy Ghost. Matt. 28, 19. In *Holy Communion* He gives His body and blood for the remission of sins, Matt. 26, 26—28. His *Word* is the means of sanctification. John 17, 17. Whoever believes His Word has eternal life. John 6, 40; 6, 63; Luke 8, 21. Blessed are they that hear the Word of God and keep it. Luke 11, 28. He that hears His Word, and believes on Him that sent Him, has everlasting life. John 5, 24. His words are words of eternal life. John 6, 68. He that is of God heareth God's Word. John 8, 47. He that rejects Him and receives not His Word hath one that judgeth him: the Word that He hath spoken, the same shall judge him in the Last Day. John 12, 48. If men continue in His Word, they are His disciples indeed, and they shall know the truth, and the truth shall make them free. John 8, 31. 32. Thus Christ, in His creed, has taught the efficacy of the means of grace, the Gospel and the Sacraments.

Furthermore, Christ, in His creed, has clearly defined the true members of His Church, His kingdom. They are not subjects in an external, worldly kingdom. John 7, 24. "Not every one that saith unto Me, Lord, Lord, shall enter into the kingdom of heaven, but he that doeth the will of My Father which is in heaven." Matt. 7, 21. The subjects of Christ's kingdom enter in at the strait gate and walk the narrow way, that leadeth unto life. Matt. 7, 13. 14. They do the will of His Father, that is, they believe His Word. Matt. 12, 50. They believe on Him whom God has sent. John 6, 29. They hear His voice and follow Him. John 10, 27. They walk in His light. John 8, 12. Thus, according to Christ's teaching, true repentance and faith in Christ determine those who are true members of His Church. Unbelievers die in their sins,

John 8, 24, and are judged already, John 3, 18; and great is their damnation: they perish, John 3, 15. They shall not see life, but the wrath of God abideth on them. John 3, 36. Blessed, however, are all believers: they have everlasting life, John 3, 16; they shall be with Christ in the mansions of the Father, John 14, 3. In this life their conduct is characterized by love and by the keeping of His commandments, John 14, 15; and though they are hated by the world, John 15, 18, they nevertheless have peace and joy, John 14, 27. 28. As branches of the true Vine, Jesus Christ, they bear much fruit, wherein the Father is glorified. John 15, 5. 8. They have the love of the Father, John 17, 26, and abide in Christ's love, John 15, 10.

This is but a brief statement and summary of the principal teachings of Christ regarding the Holy Trinity, the deity of Christ, salvation through faith in Him, the universality and damnableness of sin, the necessity of repentance, the efficacy of the means of grace, the incompetence of work-righteousness, the Christian Church, the hope of life everlasting, and the true Christian ethics proceeding from a believing heart. The theology of Jesus embraces every statement of the Christian Creed: God the Father Almighty, Maker of heaven and earth; Jesus Christ, His only Son, our Lord, who was conceived by the Holy Ghost, was born of the Virgin Mary, suffered under Pontius Pilate, was crucified, dead, and buried, descended into hell, the third day rose from the dead, ascended into heaven, and sitteth at the right hand of God the Father Almighty, from whence He shall come to judge the quick and the dead; the Holy Ghost, the holy Christian Church, the communion of saints, the forgiveness of sins, the resurrection of the body, and the life everlasting. Every one that would be saved must embrace this Creed and confess Christ as the Son of the living God and Eternal Life. Only him who confesses Him before the world will He confess before His Father in heaven; but whosoever denies Him, him He will also deny before His Father in heaven. Matt. 10, 32. 33. Such confession is necessary because Christ did not come to bring peace on earth, but the sword. Matt. 10, 34. His demand is clear: "He that loveth father or mother more than Me is not worthy of Me; and he that loveth son or daughter more than Me is not worthy of Me," Matt. 10, 37; and: "He that taketh not his cross and followeth after Me is not worthy of Me," Matt. 10, 38. "He that findeth his life shall lose it; and he that loseth his life for My sake shall find it." Matt. 10, 39.

The Relation of Christ's Theology to His Ethics. — But Christ did not only preach a distinct creed, He also clearly demonstrated the relation between His theology and the ethics which He demands of men. They bear the same relation to each other as do cause and effect. Christian deeds have their source in the Christian Creed. To the student who carefully searches the Gospel it is clear that Christ addressed His ethical demands to *believers*. To the unbelieving Pharisees, who rejected His Word, He preached the message of repentance, pronouncing upon them damnation in case they would not heed His warning. His ethical demands, however, He addressed to that smaller circle of faithful followers who accepted His Word. This is clear from the Sermon on the Mount. St. Matthew tells us distinctly that Christ went up into a mountain when He saw the multitudes of people who followed Him. Matt. 4, 25; 5, 1. To these multitudes Jesus had preached repentance, Matt. 4, 17, and the Gospel of the kingdom, Matt. 4, 23, so that His fame went throughout all Syria, and they brought unto Him all sick people that were taken with divers diseases and torments, and those which were possessed with devils, and those which were lunatic, and those who had the palsy, and He healed them. Matt. 4, 24. Hence the multitude of people to whom He addressed the Sermon on the Mount consisted of such as believed in Him. This faith He strengthened by pointing out to them faith's blessings and promises. Matt. 5, 1—12. As believers He declared them to be the salt of the earth and the light of the world. Matt. 5, 13, 14. To them as believers He expounds the Law, Matt. 5, 17, 47, exhorting them to be perfect even as their Father in heaven is perfect, Matt. 5, 48. The entire code of ethics, if we may use this term, which we find in Matt. 6 and 7, is addressed to the people as believers, as such as have accepted Christ's theology, specifically His message of repentance and faith. As believers in Him they are taught to pray the Lord's Prayer. Matt. 6, 9—13. Christ never taught the fatherhood of God in that general sense in which it is employed by Modernists to-day. He connected with this term an ethical meaning: God is the Father of men only through and in Christ. John 5, 23; 6, 44; 8, 16, 29; 10, 29. The Father loved those who believed in Him, John 16, 27; hence faith in Christ is necessary for the performance of good works. If believers abide in Christ, they bring forth much fruit. John 15, 4—10. That is the true relation between Christian ethics and Christian faith. Faith is the cause, ethics the effect. Without faith in Christ men are cast forth as branches that wither and

are cast into the fire. John 15, 6. Without Christ men can do nothing. John 15, 5. This vital fact is purposely overlooked by Liberalists, who, rejecting Christ, desire to build up a code of ethics without the creed of Christ. Christ has made it very clear that His influence lay in the fact that He is the Son of God and Savior of the world, in whom, through faith, sinful humanity has life and forgiveness, and strength to follow Him. Christ's maxim is clear: without creed no deeds that are pleasing to God; without faith no ethics; without our acknowledgment of Him no acknowledgment of us on His part, in spite of all we do. That is the great lesson of the gospels. First Christ preached the message of salvation through faith in Him, and then He commanded those of His hearers who believed on Him to walk worthy of the great salvation bestowed by grace. Only when penitent, Mary, Zacchaeus, and Peter are accepted as God's children and please Him by their ethical deeds.

However, also the miracles of Christ stood in close relation to His theology. The miracles of Christ were performed for a specific purpose. They were a means to a greater end. They were but to illustrate the paramount fact that Christ had come to save sinners. They were proofs of His love and of the truth of His theology. They were to verify the Gospel and strengthen faith in Him. When He had finished His Sermon on the Mount, He proved the truth of His message by healing the leper, Matt. 8, 1—4; the centurion's servant, Matt. 8, 5—10; the mother-in-law of Peter, Matt. 8, 14, 15, etc. St. Matthew states expressly that these miracles were accomplished in order to fulfil the prophecy of Isaiah: "Himself took our infirmities and bare our sicknesses." Matt. 8, 17. Bodily sickness is a part of the sorrow which sin has occasioned, and by healing bodily sickness, the Savior shadowed forth the perfect redemption which He gives to our souls by taking our place, being wounded for our transgressions and bruised for our iniquities. It was for this very reason that Christ performed miracles only upon those who believed in Him. He wished to show by His miracles that He had power on earth to forgive sins. "The Son of Man hath power on earth to forgive sins." Matt. 9, 6. Thus, in the last analysis, Christ's miracles served the purpose of glorifying God by proving the truth of His message. John 11, 4. All this shows that Christ had not come into the world for its social and economic improvement. He came as a divine Prophet, to preach repentance and salvation; as a divine Priest, to lay down His life for a ransom; as a divine King,

to gather in the elect through the Gospel-message. For this reason He preached the theology of salvation, performed miracles to prove the truth of His theology, and admonished His followers to walk worthy of this sublime creed.

The Task of the Christian Church. — Christ thus once for all has made clear the task of the Christian Church. It has been suggested that the Christian Church must make religion reasonable, logical, and sound in order to fill the pews. In the sense in which it is offered, this suggestion is both unreasonable and illogical. Christ's theology is the most reasonable, logical, and sound religion, and withal the only reasonable, logical, and sound religion, since it alone is the truth. John 17, 17. It satisfies the needs of the soul by offering it the redemption which it needs and by restoring to it the blessings of life and salvation which have been lost by sin. At the same time this message is a divine power unto salvation. Rom. 1, 16. The Church possesses strength at the ratio in which it proclaims this divinely powerful message in its truth and purity. Only in this way can it accomplish the purpose for which God has given His Word. Is. 55, 11. It is true, the Gospel of Jesus Christ is foolishness to the Greek and a stumbling-block to the Jew. 1 Cor. 1, 23. Nevertheless, unto those who are saved the preaching of the Cross is the power of God. 1 Cor. 1, 18. By preaching the Gospel of Christ in its purity, the Christian Church will always fill its pews with true believers and children of God. These constitute a minority, and therefore the true visible Church will ever remain relatively small. Nevertheless, the Christian Church cannot afford to deviate from the course mapped out by the great King. His great commission obtains to the end: "Go ye therefore and teach all nations, baptizing them in the name of the Father and of the Son and of the Holy Ghost, teaching them to observe all things whatsoever I have commanded you." Matt. 28, 19, 20. If the Church is obedient to this command, the promise of Christ: "Lo, I am with you alway, even unto the end of the world," Matt. 28, 20, will never fail her. She will be a light in darkness, a salt that arrests the moral decay of humanity. As the Church departs from this command, she herself will grope in darkness and augment the gloom of unbelief, immorality, and damnation. To make religion more reasonable, logical, and sound to the perverted mind of man by denying the Christian truths is a satanic suggestion. To preach the Word in its own sweet reasonableness and soundness as given by God means to walk in the footsteps of the great Teacher who came to seek and to save that

which was lost. Hence the task of the Church is clear: "If any man speak, let him speak as of the oracles of God." 1 Pet. 4, 11.

However, this requires both consecrated preachers and consecrated laymen. The present-day messengers of Christ's Gospel must possess all those qualities which Paul emphasizes in his epistles to Timothy and Titus, His followers and disciples. They must hold faith and a good conscience. 1 Tim. 1, 19. They must not defile themselves with anything that is contrary to sound doctrine. 1 Tim. 1, 10. They must labor and suffer reproach, trusting in the living God, who is the Savior of all men. 1 Tim. 4, 10. They must take heed unto themselves and unto the doctrine, continuing in them, for only in doing this, will they save both themselves and those that hear them. 1 Tim. 4, 16. They must withdraw themselves from all who teach otherwise and consent not to the wholesome words, even the words of our Lord Jesus Christ, and to the doctrine which is according to godliness, who are proud, knowing nothing, but doting about questions and strifes of words, whereof cometh envy, strife, railings, evil surmisings, perverse disputings of men of corrupt minds, destitute of the truth, supposing that gain is godliness. 1 Tim. 6, 3—5. They must fight the good fight of faith, laying hold on eternal life, whereunto they are called. 1 Tim. 6, 12. They must keep that which is committed to their trust, avoiding profane and vain babblings and oppositions of science falsely so called, which some professing, have erred concerning the faith. 1 Tim. 6, 20, 21. They must in meekness instruct those who oppose them, praying that God would give them repentance to the acknowledging of the truth; that they may recover themselves out of the snare of the devil, who are taken captive by him at his will. 2 Tim. 2, 25, 26. They must hold fast the faithful Word, that they may be able by sound doctrine both to exhort and to convince the gainsayers. Titus 1, 9. They must affirm constantly these things that they which have believed in God should be careful to maintain good works, avoiding foolish questions, genealogies, contentions, and strivings about the Law, which are unprofitable and vain; and they must reject heretics after the first and second admonition. Titus 3, 8—10. Such ministers are needed by the Church of to-day, men who are faithful and true to Christ, to the charge committed to them, and to the souls entrusted to them, going forth into the world, wise as serpents and harmless as doves, preaching to men the theology of Jesus, the Gospel of Christ, and teaching them to walk in faith and

obedience. Only such preachers benefit men unto life eternal, and only such shall receive the reward granted to faithful servants. Lastly, only such preachers will bestow upon the world the blessings of sound religion and of true ethics, pleasing to God.

Does James Contradict Paul?

Jas. 2, 14—26.

W. M. CZAMANSKE, Sheboygan, Wis.

(Submitted at the request of the Sheboygan Lutheran Conference.)

When Luther first came across this passage in the Epistle of St. James, he thought it contained an attack on Paul's doctrine of justification by faith and a defense of the pharisaic doctrine of salvation by works. Philip Melancthon, Luther's friend and co-worker, was of the same opinion; for he is reported to have said: "Whoever could reconcile them," namely, the teachings of James with those of St. Paul, "on him will I put my cap and allow him to call me a fool."

Both of these men, of course, were mistaken, because there is no contradiction here between Paul and James. "It is more than likely," as Prof. A. T. Robertson points out, "that James wrote his epistle before the Judaizing controversy came to a head, probably between A. D. 45 and 48. Certainly at the Jerusalem conference on the subject of imposing the Mosaic ceremonial regulations on the Gentile Christians, James took the side of Paul and Peter, apparently presided over the conference, and offered the solution that gave Paul the victory and the Gentiles liberty. (Acts 15, 1—29.) There is a striking resemblance in tone and style between the letter to the church at Antioch (Acts 15, 23—29) and the Epistle of James. But this section in the Epistle of James does not contradict Paul's plea for justification by faith, not of works, when properly interpreted. Paul, by 'justification,' refers to the initial act by which we are set right with God, while James, by the same term, refers to the proof of the profession which we make. There is therefore no contradiction, because the two writers are discussing different things. They likewise use 'works' in a different sense. Paul, in Rom. 3 and 4, by 'works' means the ceremonial system (legalism) as opposed to free grace, while James uses works in the sense of life. This passage of James is to be compared with Rom. 6—8 rather than with Rom. 3 and 4. By 'faith' Paul means personal trust in Jesus as the Savior from sin.

James uses 'faith' in two senses in this passage, the Pauline sense and that of mere intellectual assent to theological propositions (namely, faith of the head and mouth). James does not combat faith *per se*, but dead faith. Two ways of showing faith are presented, one by works (to prove that faith is present), the other without works (which proves that real, true faith, deserving of the name, is absent). The contrast here is not faith versus works, but live faith versus dead faith. What James pleads for is a faith that bears fruit in the life (like a good tree bearing good fruit), as was seen in the case of Abraham and Rahab." 1)

St. James begins his dissertation on live faith versus dead faith with the words: "What does it profit, my brethren, though a man say he hath faith and have not works? Can faith [existing merely in his mouth] save him?" Jesus makes a statement similar to that of James: "Not every one that saith unto Me, Lord, Lord, shall enter into the kingdom of heaven, but he that doeth the will of My Father which is in heaven." Matt. 7, 21. The Apostle John says: "Little children, let no man deceive you: he that doeth righteousness is righteous, even as He [the Father] is righteous." 1 John 3, 7. God demands performance, not mere profession. "What doth it profit?" James asks. What is the use, what good is it, "though a man say he hath faith and have not works (to prove his faith)? Can [such a] faith [which is nothing but a mere assertion] save him?" As an excuse, faith is worth no more than mere words of love, love that is found in the mouth. So James goes on with his argument: "If a brother or sister be naked and destitute of daily food and one of you say to them, Depart in peace, be ye warmed and filled [that is, fill yourselves with food]; notwithstanding ye give them not those things which are needful to the body, what doth it profit?" A brother or sister is in need of food and clothing. They are out of work because of the economic conditions beyond their control. Unable to obtain work, they beg for something to wear and something to eat. Pious platitudes and cheap words of sympathy will not relieve their needs. Perhaps the pious pretenders actually think that the needy should be grateful for the kind advice when sent away without a mouthful to eat. Did Jesus ask the multitudes who came to Him in the desert place to be satisfied with honeyed words and the aroma of dinner? No, He fed them with bread and

1) See *Homiletic Review*, February, 1917. The words in parentheses are mine. — W. M. C.

fishes. St. John says: "Whoso hath this world's good and seeth his brother have need and shutteth up his bowels of compassion from him, how dwelleth the love of God in him? My little children, let us not love in word, neither in tongue, but in deed and in truth." 1 John 3, 17. 18. Real love is known by these two marks: words of love and deeds of love. He who loves only with his words proves that he does not love at all. "Even so faith, if it hath not works, is dead in itself." The hermit is dead to the world, though not dead in himself. The faith of which James here speaks is dead in itself, dead as a corpse; for the apostle does not say, Faith that hath not works dies; but he says, "It is dead." There is no life in it, no reality. Thus James tries to bring the pious pretender to his senses, pointing out that as little as he who loves in words only can claim to love his fellow-man, so little can he claim to have true faith who has nothing wherewith to back up this assertion, no works to prove his faith. But the apostle hits the pious pretender still harder. James sees an imaginary objector before him, who challenges the apostle about his faith, since he has put such accent on works.²⁾ "Thou, James, hast thou faith? I also (as well as thou) have works." The objector thus claims to have both faith and works, but implies that James has only works and no faith. James bursts in with the answer to the challenge and rests his claim to faith on works as proofs. "Show me thy faith without [apart from] thy works, and I will show thee my faith by my works." Here James pits over against each other the two sorts of faith—the true faith, which James claims to possess and which is proved by works; and the false faith, which is mere profession and entirely apart from works. The antithesis is complete. The dispute turns on how one knows that he has faith. James rests his case on his works and, in turn, challenges the objector to prove his faith apart from his works. Here we have the very essence of the apostles' teachings: Works bear witness to, are the proofs of, faith. He who has no works cannot prove his faith for no less a reason than that he has no faith. "Who is a wise man," says James in the following chapter of our epistle, vv. 13—15, "and endued with knowledge among you? Let him show out of a good conversation his works with meekness and wisdom. But if ye have bitter envy and strife in your hearts, glory not and lie not against the truth. [For] this [professed] wisdom [which is accompanied by envy and strife and lacks meek-

2) Prof. A. T. Robertson's solution of this difficult sentence.

ness] descendeth not from above, but is earthly, sensual, devilish." And in the previous chapter, v. 26, the apostle says: "If any man among you seem to be religious and bridleth not his tongue, but deceiveth his own heart, this man's religion is vain." Everywhere the apostle argues from works backward. Where there are no works, there is no faith. Supposing you had a sort of faith, the very absence of good works would always prove that it is not the true, saving faith. For instance: "Thou believest that there is one God. Thou doest well" to believe that (over against the polytheism of the heathen); for it is written in Holy Scripture: "The Lord, our God, is one Lord." But such a faith will never save thee. Why, the devils believe that and tremble. V. 19. The devils are orthodox on this point, knowing that God is one. If your faith is no better than that of the devils, it surely cannot be the saving faith; for the devils will not be saved. The argument is a complete knock-out, and the objector is forced to take the count. James speaks to the objector, "But wilt thou know, O vain man," you senseless fellow (you can know it if you wish to), "that faith without works is dead," barren, unprofitable, unproductive, like a barren woman who has no children to comfort her?

If his objector is still dull in his understanding, James hopes to make himself clear by introducing the example of Abraham's faith. "Was not Abraham, our father, justified by works when he had offered Isaac, his son, upon the altar?"³⁾ A fictitious faith would never have done what Abraham did. If Abraham proves that only such faith which is accompanied by works is the true, living faith, then, contrariwise, it is proved that faith without works is dead in itself. In Gen. 22, 11 we read that after Abraham had stretched forth his hand and taken the knife to slay his son, "the Angel of the Lord called unto him out of heaven and said, Abraham, Abraham, lay not thine hand upon the lad; . . . for now I know that thou fearest God, seeing thou hast not withheld thy son, thine only son, from Me." In vv. 16—18 there follows a precious promise that in Abraham's Seed all the nations of the earth shall be blessed.⁴⁾ What kind of a declaration of righteousness do we find here? Are more of Abraham's sins forgiven because of his obedience? Not a syllable of that is mentioned here. On the contrary, the Angel of the Lord declares in the hearing of Isaac and, with him, before every one, publicly and audibly,

3) Philippi, *Glaubenslehre*.

4) See Preuss, *Die Rechtfertigung*, p. 172 ff.

that Abraham feared the Lord. He, however, who according to the Scriptures, fears God is declared righteous. Ever since Abraham had heard the call of God, he had been declared righteous; but this declaration was not made public, nor was it made on the ground of Abraham's works, but solely on account of faith, as Moses writes, Gen. 15, 6. But because of Abraham's humble obedience, which was a witness to God and, at the same time, a good work, Abraham's righteousness is declared publicly. St. James can therefore mean nothing but the public declaration of Abraham's righteousness, for otherwise he would have wilfully perverted the clear words of Gen. 22. If James had God's public and solemn declaration in mind, he fired a broadside into the camp of these mere mouth-believers with the story of Abraham; for they claimed Abraham as their example of a faith without work. St. James tells them that they had no right to such a claim.

V. 22. "Seest thou how faith wrought with his works?" In Abraham faith and works are inseparable. "And by works was faith made perfect," complete. When a ship approaches us on the ocean, we see the sails or the mast first of all. After a while we see the hull, and then the ship becomes completely visible. Thus we may hear some one confess his faith, but his faith is not complete until we have seen his works. Faith in the mouth alone is like the sails of a ship without the hull. Thus Abraham's faith was "made perfect" by his obedience, and the Scripture was (visibly) fulfilled which says: "Abraham believed God, and it was imputed unto him for righteousness." Philippi says: "This word of Scripture was like an unfulfilled promise, because Abraham's faith-righteousness was invisible until his obedience brought it to light. A saying is fulfilled when its statements are confirmed by facts that follow."

Now we see the perfect harmony between James and Paul. The righteousness of Abraham by faith, on which Paul builds his whole doctrine, is also what James teaches, only that James does not deal with the origin of faith, but with its manifestation. James says: "Abraham was called the friend of God." He had been God's friend long ago, as the eleventh chapter of Hebrews proves, but he was called God's friend only after he had brought his son as a sacrifice to God and the Angel of the Lord had given him the audible and solemn witness that he feared God. That is always God's way. First He clothes His own with the garment of Christ's righteousness, then they praise Him and do good works; finally they may also receive praise of men.

V. 24. "Ye see, then, how that by works a man is justified, and not by faith only." The case of Abraham shows that works must follow faith in the natural order of grace. Faith as a ground of justification is assumed as a starting-point. Then faith, which has changed the sinful heart and made it new, buds and blossoms forth into good works like a fruit-bearing tree. Faith and works go hand in hand in a well-regulated Christian life. They belong together, just as husband and wife belong together, or as a mother and her child belong together.

James adduces another example from Scripture to prove the point he wants to make. His choice falls upon a heathen and a proselyte, the first of all proselytes in the land of Canaan. It is Rahab, the woman who had lived the life of a harlot. "Likewise also was not Rahab, [even though] the harlot, justified by works when she had received the messengers and had sent them out another way?" V. 25. The story of Rahab is found in Joshua, chapters 2 and 6. According to Josh. 2, 11 she first confessed with her lips that the God of Israel was God in heaven above and in earth beneath, and afterwards she proved the true nature of her faith by saving the spies. That led to her public justification; for, when Joshua had captured Jericho, he said to the two men who had spied out the country: "Go into the harlot's house and bring out thence the woman and all that she hath, as ye swore unto her. And the young men that were spies went in and brought out Rahab and her father and her mother and her brethren and all that she had; and they brought out all her kindred and left them without the camp of Israel. And they burned the city with fire and all that was therein. And Joshua saved Rahab, the harlot, alive . . . because she hid the messengers, which Joshua sent to spy out Jericho." Josh. 6, 22—25. How is it possible, in the light of this narrative, to deny that James is speaking of the public justification? Where do we read that Rahab, because of her good works, received a greater measure of forgiveness? This alone is certain, that she, as a result of the good work done before the eyes of all Israel, was led out of Jericho and spared. Therefore she is a positive proof for the statement of James that not faith alone, but faith and works, justifies before men. If Rahab had done no more than to confess: Your God is "God in heaven above and in earth beneath," Israel would never have declared her righteous. But because she not only confessed (said that she had faith), but also saved the spies, her life was spared. "For as the body without the spirit is dead, so faith without works is dead." When a human

body is found in the forest, the first thing that we try to do is to see whether it still breathes. If it breathes, we know that the body is still alive; if it does no longer breathe, we say we have found a dead person. Thus it is with faith. If the witness of works is not there, every man judges that it is dead.

Thus we have the plain meaning of Jas. 2, 14—26. Our fathers have always understood this passage thus. All other explanations are either contrary to God's Word or do not do full justice to this text. Some say James contradicts Paul. If he did, then God's curse would fall upon him, as it is written Gal. 1, 8: "But though we or an angel from heaven preach any other gospel unto you than that which we have preached unto you, let him be accursed. As we said before, so say I now again, If any man preach any other gospel unto you than that ye have received, let him be accursed." In reality, James has preached no other gospel; for in chapter 1, 18 he has taught that we are begotten by the Word of Truth, and in chapter 1, 21, that God's Word is able to save our souls, and that by receiving it with meekness, that is, by believing it, we are declared righteous and are justified before God as children of our heavenly Father and receive forgiveness of sins, life, and salvation.

Others, like the Jesuit Perrone, say: "There is harmony between James and Paul, namely thus: Both teach that 'faith justifies *per opera*.'" Truly, neither of these two teach such a doctrine; for Paul teaches that we are justified by faith, without the deeds of the Law, and James, that we are justified by faith and works. He who does not want to admit that Paul is speaking of the hidden justification of a sinner before God and James of the public justification of a child of God before men, even as Jesus does in Matt. 25, 31—46, had better not attempt to make fire and water mix.

A more silly solution of the problem before us is advocated by the father of Socinianism. "When James says works," Faustus Socinus advises us, "he means faith." A truly remarkable discovery! Indeed, we would have to be prepared to make a considerable change in the whole system of Christian doctrine if this principle, to exchange one contrast for the other, should ever gain ground.

If we take Jas. 2, 14—26 without the perversions of Socinianism and Jesuitism,⁵⁾ it becomes to us a clear, wholesome, in-

5) Preuss, *Die Rechtfertigung*, p. 188.

dispensable chapter. For nowhere else in Scripture can you find the medicine needed against the misunderstanding and misuse of Paul's doctrine so often made by the old Adam. One is almost tempted to take out a drop of James's doctrine and put it, with the author of the Codex Alexandrinus, after Rom. 8, 1, both as an explanation and as a warning: "There is, therefore, now no condemnation to them which are in Christ Jesus." "Who walk not after the flesh," are the words added by the writer of the Codex Alexandrinus. And a corrector of Claromontanus supplied the words: "but after the Spirit."

In the *International Critical Commentary* on James, James Hardy Ropes says: "In 2, 14—26 James is not engaged in doctrinal controversy, but is repelling the practical misuse which was made, or which might be made, of Paul's doctrine of justification by faith alone in order to excuse moral laxity." (p. 35.)

THE THEOLOGICAL OBSERVER.

British Celebrities in Westminster Abbey. — While wandering through the maze of chapels composing Westminster Abbey a few years ago and passing by the tombs and commemorative tablets of British celebrities, I asked myself time and again, By what principle did this or that personage gain admission to this Christian sanctuary? Evidently not by the principle of a Christian profession of faith and consequent Christian life and conduct. For by that principle not a few of the names in Westminster Abbey would have to be removed. The handbook of Westlake, the custodian of the Abbey, warned me that I "would do well to remember that many of those who are commemorated within its walls were scarcely deserving of the honor which ordinarily attaches to such commemorations." I had to force myself to forget that I was walking in a great church and to say to myself: This is an apartment of the British state, an exhibition of its earthly greatness and secular glory and renown. It is a consistent deduction from the state-church theory, which is to-day probably stronger in official England than anywhere else in the world. That is what may be expected when Christ is hitched to Caesar's imperial chariot. But what a parody on Christianity! And now comes Bishop Ryle, Dean of the Abbey, and rules that Byron can have no place in the Abbey because he was immoral. If some of the tombstones and tablets in the Abbey could speak, they would call the bishop's decision a post-mortem joke on themselves. Of course, Byron does not deserve to be commemorated in a Christian church, but he belongs in Westminster Abbey among some of his compeers; for he was a great Briton spite of the fact that he was a great pig. Bishop Ryle's decision will not deceive any one who

knows Westminster Abbey and the character of the Established Church into believing that the decision was prompted by his Christian conscience.

DAU.

Modernism and Fundamentalism Briefly Defined. — In order to exhibit at a glance the difference between Modernism and Fundamentalism, Dr. E. J. Pace some time ago drew a cartoon for the *Moody Monthly* of Chicago. It shows two steep cliffs separated by a chasm. Over the top of the picture this legend is printed: "No Middle Ground — Only a Chasm." Over the cliff on the left side this heading is inscribed: "The Faith which was Once for All Delivered unto the Saints." Down the face of this cliff the following seven facts of orthodox belief are recorded: —

1. The Bible IS the Word of God. "The Book judges man."
2. Jesus Christ is THE Son of God in a sense which no other is.
3. The birth of Jesus was SUPERNATURAL.
4. The death of Jesus was EXPIATORY.
5. Man is the product of special CREATION.
6. Man is a SINNER, fallen from original righteousness, and, apart from God's redeeming grace, is hopelessly lost.
7. Man is justified by FAITH in the atoning blood of Christ; result: supernatural regeneration from ABOVE.

Over the cliff on the right side is the inscription: "Modernist Theology," and down the face of this cliff the following seven contradictory views are recorded: —

1. The Bible CONTAINS the Word of God. "Man judges the Book."
2. Jesus Christ is A Son of God in the sense which *all* men are.
3. The birth of Jesus was NATURAL.
4. The death of Jesus was EXEMPLARY.
5. Man is the product of EVOLUTION.
6. Man is the unfortunate VICTIM of environment, but through self-culture can "make good."
7. Man is justified by WORKS, in following Christ's example; result: natural development from WITHIN.

The *Sunday-school Times* (Aug. 23) reprints this cartoon and remarks: "Of course, the word 'Modernist' includes a wide range. There are 'extreme' Modernists, and there are 'moderate' Modernists. But the moment one accepts *any* position of the Modernist, even in the most moderate degree, he has driven the thin edge into the Christian faith and has opened the way to the logical abandonment of Christianity." The last sentence deserves to be emphasized. It is very true, and if it is applied to some who call themselves "Fundamentalists," they lose their classification and are switched over to the Modernist side, where they really belong.

DAU.

Unionism under a New Guise. — The Breslau Synod's *Kirchenblatt* reported September 14: "In his paper *Fuer Bibel und Bekenntnis* Pastor Franke writes regarding the new constitution of the church at Frankfurt on the Main. The preamble, which does not belong to the constitution that was approved by the state, reads: "The Evangelical *Landeskirche* of Frankfurt a. M. confesses the faith

of Christendom as proclaimed by the evangelists and apostles and declares the Gospel of the grace of God in Jesus Christ as professed by the Reformers to be the inviolable basis of its doctrine, activity, and communion. It defines the confessional status of its congregations as immovable and through the church convention summoned for that purpose lays down the new constitution as follows." By appealing in a general way to the professions of the Reformers, but not to their particular confessional writings, this preamble strips the new church of its Lutheran and, by referring to the faith of Christendom as the "apostles" and "evangelists" proclaimed it, but not the Apostles' Creed, which is regarded as the norm of that faith throughout Christendom, of its ecumenical Christian character.—The official pledge (*Amtsgeluebde*) of pastors (§ 42) reads thus: "I promise in the presence of God and this Christian congregation that I will faithfully and diligently preach from the Holy Scriptures, without fear or favor of men, the Gospel of the free grace of God in Christ Jesus, our Lord, the Savior and Redeemer of the world, as it was testified by our fathers during the Reformation; that I will administer the holy Sacraments in accordance with the order adopted by the Church; that I will consecrate my gifts and strength to the service of the *Landeskirche*; that I will discharge my office in accordance with its laws and orders; and that I will show myself in every respect a faithful servant of my Lord Jesus Christ. So help me God!" Pastor Franke comments on this pledge as follows: "The pastors to be installed are pledged to be faithful to the *Landeskirche*, which has no confessional standard (*bekenntnisslos*), and must promise to place all their strength at the service of the *Landeskirche*. The only reference to the confessional question in the entire constitution is found in the exemption of all Reformed pastors from taking the pledge to be faithful to what is termed the *Landeskirche*. § 51 reads: The rules laid down in §§ 8—48 do not apply to the two Evangelical Reformed congregations of the *Landeskirche*. This corresponds with the clause in § 94, 8, the only place in which doctrine is mentioned: The rights of the Reformed congregations are not affected." Accordingly, the Reformed congregations are exempt from all unionistic decisions, but the Lutherans are bound by them and are to be officially pledged to obey them. And still, spite of this fact, it is boldly asserted that the former church has "not been changed in any respect except in its name."—Against this new constitution Pastor Franke has issued a protest, which concludes with these words: "I submit once more to the consistory this statement of my understanding of the situation, which is shared not only by a great part of my congregation, but also by many members of other congregations, and declare that for reasons of conscience this statement is binding upon me personally in my official relation. It is plain from this statement that I am not in a position to assume any responsibility over and against the new church, but I regard myself as bound by my ordination-vow and my official pledge to my congregation to remain faithful to, and henceforth to serve, that part of it which declines these ecclesiastical innovations." The con-

sistory, on August 9, sent the following reply: ". . . Your view that a new *Landeskirche* has sprung up in Frankfurt a. M. is erroneous. The former evangelical church has only changed its name and received an external new order, but in every other respect it has remained unchanged, the same that it was before. Accordingly, your declaration amounts to nothing but an expression of a personal opinion. We expect from you, in the future as in the past, the prompt fulfilment of your obligation. In case of your opposition we shall inexorably proceed against you."—Pastor Franke will likely have the sympathy of Lutherans in his conflict with his tyrannous consistory, which, by the way, talks the exact language of the old sovereign *Staatskirche*. Still the consistory may be right in stating that no essential change has been made by the new constitution. The Lutherans were pledged to unionism also under the old constitution, and the omission of a few venerable phrases savoring of orthodoxy contained in the old document were a paper confession. Perhaps the new constitution was needed to open Pastor Franke's eyes. May it open many others!

DAU.

What the Supreme Council Favors.—According to the *Scottish Rite Clip Service*, a semimonthly bulletin issued under the authority of the Supreme Council of the Scottish Rite of Freemasonry, the latter favors the following points regarding public education in our country:—

1. A Federal Department of Education with a secretary in the President's Cabinet and Federal aid for public school purposes under the absolute control of the States.

2. A national university at Washington, supported by the Government.

3. The compulsory use of English as the language of instruction in the grammar grades.

4. Adequate provision for the education of the alien population, not only in cultural and vocational subjects, but especially in the principles of American institutions and popular sovereignty.

5. The entire separation of Church and State and opposition to every attempt to appropriate public moneys, directly or indirectly, for the support of sectarian institutions.

6. The American public school, non-partisan, non-sectarian, efficient, democratic; for all the children of all the people; equal educational opportunities for all.

7. The inculcation of patriotism, love of the flag, respect for law and order and undying loyalty to constitutional government.

This program Freemasonry is bound to carry out. It is therefore well to remember what is coming. Also, it is wise to bear in mind why the Supreme Council favors these seven points. MUELLER.

Emotion or Education.—The *Christian Herald* (October 11) regrets "that the seminaries training young men for the ministry are tending toward an educational and intellectual program, in sharp contrast to the emotional or evangelistic type of ministerial training of the last century." "No less than twenty-five years ago," the editorial says, "the great Christian Endeavor Society met in a Western

city, and there was an attendance of more than 40,000 young people from all over the world. These young people got up every morning for more than a week and had sunrise prayer-meetings. Then they attended religious meetings of emotional intensity all day long and far into the night. There were scenes of tremendous emotional experience that could not be called irrational or fanatical [*sic?*]. We wonder if such a convention would be possible to-day. How many times have ministers of the modern Church heard sobs in their church services caused by repentance for sin? Is emotion going to be ruled out of the Christian experience? Is cold intellectuality going to be the mark of Jesus' disciples? It will be a poor and stupid life in the religious experience of mankind if the time ever comes when the intellectual overrules the spiritual."

What is to be regretted is not the passing away of the old-time frenzied revival, but the elimination of true Gospel-preaching. The revival was as antiscritptural as is the modern method of ruling out God's Word from pulpit and church. Wherever the Word of God is preached, there both the will and the intellect are rightly influenced by the Holy Ghost.

MUELLER.

"To the Hell of Deserved Oblivion." — "Let us do our level best to send these writers of corruption to the hell of deserved oblivion," writes the *Watchman-Examiner* (August 7). "We are not in the habit," the editorial declares, "of reading salacious literature. We detest it as we detest the rank odors of an open sewer. Unfortunately, the highways of our literary life are imperiled by the presence of many unsavory cesspools in these days. The unwary wayfarer does not always scent their putridity, but too often tumbles in. So, quite without warning of danger, we were beguiled into reading a recent debauching novel."

After describing the novel, the name of which he does not mention, "in order not to advertise it," the writer proceeds: "The story is morbid and thoroughly rotten. It is bad because it sneers at religion and mentions God only to profane His holy name. It is bad because it is emphatically immoral, making light of honesty, sobriety, and purity — these three words are carefully chosen. From beginning to end there is not one line that comforts or strengthens or vitalizes. There is just a mixture of dish-water and garbage. The author plays to the lowest passions; he wilfully confuses lust and love; he has no word for the higher self. This is not paganism; it is not healthy animalism: it is sheer indecency.

"A little more interest on the part of our pastors would not be out of place. These men are asked to speak with fitting eloquence on all sorts of topics. Is it fair to call their attention to yet another subject? It is, when that subject concerns the soul of youth. Our people are a reading people. Our youth read many books. Fiction is the favorite form of literature, as the librarians of the land can testify. Is it well when the young men and young women of America are at the mercy of these literary ghouls, trained in ways of indecent thinking and degenerate imaginings?"

This reminds us that Synod has appointed a Board for Juvenile Literature, which is working hard to select suitable literature for our young people. It reminds us also of the fact that it is not quite fair to the Lutheran author who wishes to create a wholesome literature for Christian boys and girls to have his books and writings ignored just because he happens to be a Lutheran. Such things, however, are being done to the harm of books worthy of being read. MUELLER.

The Williamstown Institute of International Politics, which convened about a month ago, proved among other things that also men in high places are bound to talk. The Institute was characterized by "bursts of forensic fireworks," as *Time* (September 8) relates.

Oswald Garrison Villard, pacifist editor of the *Nation*, drew much odium upon himself by assailing United States men and methods in our Government's Latin-American policy. He said: "The United States rules all but six Latin-American republics 'by bullets and bankers.' The blood of the 3,000 Haytians slain by our American marines and of the 400 dead in Vera Cruz, mostly women and children, dishonors our good name, especially when involved with so sordid a business as debt collection." The army and navy officers answered this outburst with the cry, "Sit down! Sit down!"

The Rev. E. A. Walsh, of Georgetown University, Director-General of the Papal Relief Mission in Russia, stated that the Soviet Government had officially admitted to the execution of 1,800,000 persons between 1917 and 1922. Arthur B. Ruhl, traveler and journalist, declared the figures "quite impossible." However, Father Walsh stuck to his story and received support from Sir Bernard Pares, the English editor.

Prof. Henry Pratt Fairchild, of New York University, reiterated his solemn warning to the world against overpopulation and urged an ethical birth-control as well as a curb upon migration. The learned speaker was not asked to sit down.

After this the august body adjourned, and a dainty luncheon was served by the amiable hostess. MUELLER.

Church Union in Canada. — After long years of debate, Canada's Parliament passed a bill last spring officially uniting the Dominion Presbyterians, Congregationalists, and Methodists. Every church, however, in each of these denominations may decide for itself whether or not it will accept the union. The number of Congregational and Methodist churches which will vote to remain outside the union will be insufficient to warrant the perpetuation of those two denominations in Canada. But of Presbyterians there are irreconcilables a-plenty. Nearly a third of the Presbyterian churches will probably hold aloof from the union. Meanwhile the example of Canada is being preached throughout the world by advocates of church union, although the practical results, at least in the United States, are likely to be quite different. Here the Methodists, at present the largest church-body in the United States, are liable to absorb the other denominations if the church union will really take place. MUELLER.

Concerning our very own K. K. K. our British cousins are forming interesting opinions, which the *Illustrated London News* of September 13 voices as follows: "Singularly little is told us in the English papers about the American crisis in connection with the Ku Klux Klan. If it were the fifth marriage following on the fourth divorce of a young woman who happened to be good-looking enough for the films, we should be told about it in considerable detail. We are sometimes interested in what happens *in* America. But apparently we are not at all interested in what happens *to* America. And the problem of this secret society has already become the pivot of a Presidential election and may yet become the genesis of a schism like that of the North and South. Even if it had been anything so ordinary as the murder of a millionaire, it would probably have been reported with the richest elaboration. But apparently we are interested in murders and not in massacres. Of the Ku Klux Klan, in the only aspect which ever does interest the journalists, that of its curious parody of a church, its ritual, mysteries, masks, head-dresses, and all the rest, it is hardly worth while to write. It is sufficient to say that one of its brightest ideas is to call a gentleman a Kleagle, thereby (it will be noted) achieving the triumph of assimilating the word 'eagle' to the alliterative diction of the Klan. The thought of being terrorized by people on that intellectual level suggests a nightmare of falling into the hands of cheerful chimpanzees. There is something quite subhuman about such stupidity as that. About the criminal anarchy that it has let loose a great many things might be said if there were space for them. It is enough to say that it is certainly worse than anything the wilder element in America has yet produced, and that there is far less excuse for it than for the occasional lynchings that horrified our more humane civilization in the past. It has obviously little or nothing to do with the old Ku Klux Klan or with the old South. For instance, it has lately disregarded the civilized distinction which protected women. The old South, to do it justice, would have been the last to disregard that. Also the old Southern fear of the Negro seems to be quite secondary to a fear of a number of totally different and strangely incongruous social figures. The Jew and the Roman Catholic, who have been opposed to each other in almost all the controversies of the world, are opposed in the same blind and blundering fashion by the Ku Klux Klan. And just as this spirit expressed its disapproval of African savages by roasting them after the fashion of cannibals, so it expresses its disapproval of the errors of popery by establishing an irresponsible Spanish Inquisition. . . . Unfortunately this reactionary spirit has two other elements, which profess to give it an expression and largely use it as an excuse. First, there is an element in America notably absent in England, an element of ferocity and savagery. Secondly, there is that infinitely dangerous and generally indefensible thing—a secret society. It is perfectly obvious that the method is being used more and more, not merely for crime, but for criminal insanity. These things may not all have the same source; but that is exactly the weakness of a secret society. A secret society can never clear itself of any crimes as long as it re-

mains secret. And even the admitted anarchy and atrocity are bad enough. When such people call themselves the sons of the Puritans, one is tempted to agree that they are indeed the sons of those who butchered prisoners at Philiphaugh or hunted witches at Salem. But indeed the old Puritans were far less lawless and were not, relatively to their time, so terribly like a last rally of barbarians."

(Communicated by *Rev. H. Ruhland*, Ottawa, Can.)

BOOK REVIEW.

Synodical Reports of the Missouri Synod: *Northern Illinois District.* Eleventh Report. 88 pages; 42 cts. — *Michigan District.* Fifty-fourth Report. 88 pages; 42 cts. (Concordia Publishing House, St. Louis, Mo.)

The report of the Northern Illinois District contains a German essay by Pastor H. Heise on "Christ's Kingdom of Glory" and a German essay by Pastor Arthur H. C. Both on "Cooperation of Sunday-school and Parochial School for the Upbuilding of the Church of God." The report of the Michigan District contains the continuation of a German essay by Pastor J. Schinnerer on "The Church in the Field of this World." Both reports contain the usual statistical matter, the report of the mission board, the treasurer's report, etc. The proceedings of the Michigan District also contain a report of its School Defense Committee.

FRITZ.

A Manual of Church History. By *Albert Henry Newman, D. D., LL. D.* Vol. I; XIII and 639 pages. \$2.00 net. Vol. II; XI and 724 pages. \$2.00 net. (The American Baptist Publication Society, Philadelphia.)

The apparent diligence in compiling from many sources the contents of 1,300 pages, the splendid arrangement of the material, and the clear presentation of the subject-matter, together with a good typographical make-up and an attractive binding, are features which, if there were no other considerations, would commend as a splendid text Newman's *Manual of Church History*. The most important factor, however, in writing church history is that history be recorded with painstaking accuracy, in order that the reader or the student may get the *facts*, even though the author himself or the student may disagree with the matter presented. The value of subjective church history must, however, be appraised in accordance with the theological convictions of the church historian. Experience proves that a Roman Catholic, a Lutheran, a Baptist, a modern liberalist, writing on the same subject, will produce "history" which is not the same.

From the outset we would not expect that Newman, a Baptist, would so write a text-book on church history that we Lutherans could agree with him *in his judgments*. But we do expect that any Protestant would so write of Luther and the Reformation that a true picture is presented to the reader or to the student. By common consent Protestants have recognized the great value of Luther's Reformation. Even Newman says: "Whatever opinion may be held regarding the soundness and value of his reformatory work, Martin Luther is by common consent the central figure in the Protestant Revolution. . . . Luther was a man of profound religious

nature, who had been led by overwhelming conviction of sin and experience of divine grace, through the study of the Scriptures, of the writings of Augustine, and of the great German mystics of the fourteenth and fifteenth centuries, and through the influence of the revival of learning, to repudiate all efforts to secure salvation by outward observances and to regard salvation as entirely a matter of grace and the human means of attaining to justification as faith in Jesus Christ. He had become noted for his piety and learning long before 1517 and was already beginning to be widely known and honored for his writings." (Vol. II, pp. 41. 52.)

He, however, who learns his "church history" from Newman's *Manual* will receive an altogether wrong impression of Luther and his work and, as a result, of the Lutheran Church of our day. In his preface, Newman tells us that "he has conscientiously striven to record the facts as he has found them, without distorting them in the slightest degree in favor of any particular view of history or any peculiar tenets of his denomination." (Vol. I, p. VII.) The fact is that Newman has not succeeded in doing what he has promised to do.

We shall give a few samples of Newman's utterances and, without much comment, leave it to the reader to judge for himself. "Luther," says Newman, "was influenced by, and partially embodied in his reformatory scheme, all of the various reformatory forces that had been developed during the medieval time. It was impracticable, with such a combination of influences and purposes, for the highest ideal to be reached, *viz.*, the restoration of Christianity to its primitive purity and simplicity. The politico-ecclesiastical movement known as Lutheranism involved in itself many inconsistencies. It failed to produce among the people the high standard of Christian living that the leaders themselves considered desirable; it speedily became as openly intolerant and as atrocious in its persecuting measures as the Roman Catholic Church which it sought to supplant; and the principles and methods adopted at the beginning rendered inevitable the religious wars that so fearfully devastated Europe from 1545 to 1648." (Vol. II, p. 41.) "The violence of his [Luther's] polemical language is almost without parallel. When aroused by opposition, he lost all regard for decency and sometimes, apparently, even for truth. Those who opposed him, and in him the cause of God, were *ipso facto* shown to be utterly reprobate and capable of all sorts of iniquity. We can best understand Luther's work by regarding him as filled with the idea that he had a great mission to perform as an apostle of God, and that all opposition to his work was prompted by the devil. It seems probable that at the beginning of his reformatory career, Luther's motives were pure, but that his character was seriously damaged by his experiences as a politico-ecclesiastical leader. Toward the close of his life he became almost intolerable, even to his friends, so great was his bitterness and his intolerance of the least opposition. He spent his life in trying to tear down papal authority; but he certainly tried to arrogate to himself almost equal supremacy — not for his sake, perhaps, but because he regarded himself as the great representative of God's cause on earth." (pp. 52. 53.)

Newman is not satisfied with such a general characterization of Luther's character, but he devotes a special chapter of almost seven pages to "Some Demoralizing Elements in Luther's Teachings and Life." In this chapter two accusations against Luther, coming from a Protestant church

historian, are particularly surprising. Newman writes: "It was natural, perhaps, that in controversy with papists, who put undue emphasis on works in relation to salvation, Luther should have decried good works. He was not content, however, with holding up to contempt the ceremonial observances, pilgrimages, fastings, and other ascetical practises of the papists, but he constantly expressed just as strongly his disapproval of the scrupulous efforts of mystics and Anabaptists to imitate Christ and to carry out in their lives the precepts of the Sermon on the Mount. Of course, his writings abound in passages in which good living is recognized as a necessary fruit of the regenerate life; but some specimens of utterances that tended to produce carelessness regarding conduct will be in place here. In his *Church Postilla* he writes: 'Would to God I had a voice like a thunderclap, that I might shout to all the world and might pluck the little word "good works" out of all men's hearts, mouths, ears, and books.' 'God speaks through the Law: "This do, this leave undone, this will I have from thee." But the Gospel preaches not what we are to do or to leave undone, requires nothing of us,' etc. In 1523 he wrote: 'Oh, it is much more necessary now to preach against the subtle, sanctimonious, plausible perversion of the world through the shorn people [monks] than to preach against public sinners, heathen, and Turks, against robbers and murderers, thieves and adulterers.' In his Commentary on Genesis he wrote: 'The life is far less important than the doctrine, so that, even if the life be not so pure, the doctrine may yet well remain pure and the life may be borne with. . . . It is a high grace to be able to separate the life from the doctrine.' 'Faith which does not include love justifies. Unless faith is without any, even the least, works, it does not justify, nay, is not faith.' 'This faith, without any antecedent love, justifies.' 'For if love is a form of faith, I am at once compelled to think that love itself is the principal and greatest part of the Christian religion.' 'Whatsoever sins I, thou, and all of us have committed or shall commit in the future are just as much Christ's own as if He Himself had committed them.' Luther insisted that the Christian should believe himself holy and glory in his holiness, however sinful his life might be. For a sinning Christian to say, 'He is a poor sinner, is the same as to say: I do not believe that Christ has died for me, and that I have been baptized, and that the blood of Christ has cleansed me.' Pangs of conscience for sins committed by a Christian he regarded as the temptation of Satan. 'The true saints of Christ must be good, strong sinners,' etc. The following is perhaps one of the most ethically dangerous of Luther's utterances: 'Thou owest God nothing save to believe and confess. In all things else He gives thee absolute freedom to do as thou wilt without any peril of conscience, so that He on his part does not even make any inquiry as to whether you put away your wife, run away from your master, and violate your covenant.' But he qualifies this statement by saying that since others are involved in such proceedings, we are under obligation to do them no wrong. 'God gives thee this freedom only in what is thine own, not in what is thy neighbor's. . . . Before God it is a matter of indifference that a man should forsake his wife; for the body is not bound to God, but is made free by him with respect to all things external and is only inwardly God's own through faith; but before men the obligation holds.' It would seem to be implied in this passage that husbands and wives might freely separate by

mutual consent. Other disastrous applications of the principle will readily suggest themselves." (pp. 87—89.)

The student of Luther's writings at once recognizes what has happened. Luther insists that a Christian *must* do good works as *an evidence of his faith*. Newman even quotes Luther to this effect. He speaks very highly of Luther's tract *Concerning Christian Liberty* and then quotes the following words from Luther: "Good works do not make a good man, but a good man does good works. Bad works do not make a bad man, but a bad man does bad works. Thus it is always necessary that the substance, or person, should be good before any good works can be done, and that good works should follow and proceed from a good person.... We do not, then, reject good works; nay, we embrace them and teach them in the highest degree. It is not on their own account that we condemn them, but on account of this impious addition to them and the perverse notion of seeking justification by them." (p. 61.) When Luther, however, in these words and in his other writings, insists that *in reference to man's salvation* good works cannot have any place, but alone the grace of God, Newman does not seem to understand Luther at all, but actually makes him "decry good works"; yes, he even goes so far as to draw the conclusion that Luther gave the Christian a license to sin if he only believed.

The other accusation against Luther, in the chapter to which we refer above, reads as follows: "Luther indulged without restraint in wine- and beer-drinking and trusted that the Lord God would excuse him for occasional excesses on the ground that for twenty years he had crucified and macerated his body. He is determined that when he lies in his coffin, the worms shall have a good fat doctor to eat. In 1529 he, in company with Amsdorf, drank Malvasian wine so excessively as to bring on a catarrh that came near proving fatal. The next year he attributed an affection of the throat either to the violence of the wine, the return of old troubles, or the buffeting of Satan. His conviviality and his frequent frivolity were scandalous to many of his friends and were constantly urged against him and his movement by Catholics, Mystics, and Anabaptists. No doubt, much of Luther's intemperate language was due to his drinking habit." (p. 90.) If Luther had been the low character which Newman makes him out to be, we Lutherans could hardly feel proud of him or of the Church which is named after him; but by the common consent of historians Luther's *character* is unimpeachable.

A few additional quotations will help to convince our readers that Newman in his *Manual* grossly misrepresents what *Lutheranism* stands for. He says: "Let us take *Lutheranism* as the most influential element in the Protestant Revolution and as fairly representative of the entire politico-ecclesiastical movement and test it by the categories that have been laid down. Did Lutheranism employ, to the best advantage, the pure elements of opposition to the hierarchy that had come down from the past, rejecting the vitiating elements? Did Lutheranism secure the ends whose accomplishment was indispensable to a pure reformation—the abolition of sacerdotalism, the abolition of the unhallowed union of Church and State, the reinstatement of the Scriptures as the guide of faith and practise?" "We find in the character, the actions, and the writings of Luther—his writings furnish an almost perfect index to his character—all sorts of inconsistencies. Luther could be Biblical when it suited his purpose.

When he would refute the claims of the hierarchy, no man could urge the supreme authority of Scripture more vigorously than he. But does he always so urge it? Let us see. When James is quoted against his favorite doctrine of justification by faith alone, with marvelous audacity he turns upon the luckless writing and denounces it as a 'right strawy epistle.' So, also, he contrasted the Gospel according to John with the other gospels, greatly to the disadvantage of the latter. So, also, the Book of Revelation was not of such a character as divine inspiration would have given. Other books of Scripture fared no better. Again, when he came into controversy with rigid adherents of the Biblical principle, he no longer held that in ecclesiastical practise that only is allowable which is sanctioned by Scripture, but that it is sufficient if prevalent practises are not distinctly forbidden by Scripture. His Roman Catholic opponents were not slow to see Luther's inconsistencies, and they made vigorous use of them in their polemics. Again, Luther apprehended the great Biblical doctrine of the priesthood of believers and the consequent right of every Christian to interpret the Scriptures according to his own judgment, enlightened by the Spirit. Yet, practically, he made his own interpretation the only admissible one and did not hesitate to revile and persecute those who arrived at results different from his own. Again, Luther apprehended that most important Biblical doctrine, justification by faith. He saw in the failure to recognize this doctrine the ground of all papal corruptions. Instead of tempering this doctrine by the complementary teachings of the Scriptures, he really made it the supreme criterion of truth. Whatever Scripture could not be made to teach justification by faith alone was for Luther no Scripture at all. So, also, while professing to give the first place to Scripture, he practically put Augustine in the first place, interpreting Scripture by Augustinian dogma rather than Augustinian dogma by Scripture. It is evident, therefore, that Luther did not hold to the Biblical principle purely and consistently." (pp. 116. 117.) "There is no sufficient reason for calling in question the fact that he was a man of profoundly spiritual life. But it is certain that the mystical element was almost entirely lost to his followers. The general effect of his preaching, so far as we can judge from his own statements and those of his most intimate friends, compared with those of his opponents, was not in the direction of personal religious experience, but rather of a dead faith and a blind assurance. The preaching and writings of Luther were destructive rather than constructive. He could, by his denunciations, undermine papal authority and bring the doctrine of salvation by works into utmost contempt; but he failed signally to develop an apostolical in the place of a monkish piety in his followers. It may safely be affirmed that the mystical element among the reformatory forces was not made the most of by Luther and his followers—certainly little of it appeared among his followers. It was almost supplanted by the doctrine of justification by faith alone, apprehended by many in a semiantinomian way." (pp. 117. 118.) "The maintenance of the union of Church and State was the most vicious point in Luther's system. As the uniting of Church and State had done more than all other influences combined to corrupt the Church, and as this union always furnished the most unyielding obstacle to reform, so its retention by Luther made it absolutely impossible that any thorough reformation of the Church should find place." (p. 119.)

In a chapter on the "Characteristics of the Calvinistic Reformation," Newman writes: "Calvinism had the following advantages over Lutheranism and Zwinglianism: a. As compared with Lutheranism. (a) It was more thoroughly evangelical, being hampered by no ecclesiastical realism. (b) It was far more consistent in its theology and its church polity. (c) Christian life was emphasized more, and the hundreds of young men that went forth from Calvin's training were filled with a spirit of self-sacrifice and evangelical zeal unknown among Wittenberg students. (d) Calvinism was less national and more catholic in spirit than Lutheranism. (e) Calvinism respected and utilized, while Lutheranism and Zwinglianism drove forth, in the form of Anabaptism, etc., most of the intense religious zeal developed through its influence. b. As compared with Zwinglianism. (a) It had an incomparably greater leader. (b) Whereas Zwinglianism put itself into a polemical attitude toward Lutheranism, Calvinism was irenic in its tendency. (c) The religious earnestness and moral rigor of Calvinism shine forth as conspicuously in comparison with Zwinglianism as in comparison with Lutheranism. (d) Calvinism carried out thoroughly what was only feebly attempted by Zwinglianism and not at all by Lutheranism—church discipline." (p. 202.)

Newman's History closes with the year 1903. We dare say that since that time, *not in spite of*, but *because of*, the "irenic tendency" of Calvinism—we call it indifferentism—a very deplorable situation has arisen among the non-Lutheran Protestant denominations of our country. While Lutheranism still lacks none of its original virility and its power to confess and insist on the purity of that doctrine which is taught in the verbally inspired Word of God, Calvinism has not only failed to stem the tide of increasing indifferentism, but has by its own momentum helped to develop this and has given us as one of its latest results—modern religious liberalism. The followers of "the peace-loving Melancthon" and the advocates of "Calvin's mediating position," p. 222, have failed to appreciate, but have rather denounced, Luther's strict adherence to the Scriptures and his uncompromising steadfastness to their own hurt. FRITZ.

Syllabus for New Testament Study. A Guide for Lessons in the Classroom. By A. T. Robertson, D. D. Cloth, 274 pages. \$2.00, net. (George H. Doran Company, New York, N. Y.)

This is the fifth revised and greatly enlarged edition of Professor Robertson's *Syllabus for New Testament Study*. Originally the book was written for the author's classes in the English New Testament and was to serve the function of a broad outline of the New Testament history with precise references to the text-books used for the daily lessons. Since the work was not designed for general use, much valuable material has been omitted which we regard as necessary for the average extramural student of the New Testament. Only the student who is in reach of a good library is able to use the book with success. The average pastor's greatest benefit would be derived from the excellent bibliographies, both general and special, which it offers. So much has been written on every phase of New Testament study that it is almost impossible for the student to find his way through the labyrinth of books unless he has a guide. As such Dr. Robertson's book may be of real service. MUELLER.

Old Testament Law for Bible Students. By *Roger S. Galer*. 194 pages, 5×7¾. Cloth, \$1.25. (The Macmillan Co., New York, N. Y.)

This book attempts to classify the Old Testament laws according to the general standards used in modern law. There are four great divisions: *Public Law*, with the subheads: Civil Government, Military Laws, Courts, and Legal Procedure; *Private Law*, under which are grouped Domestic Relations, Laws of Inheritance, Laws relating to Real Property, Personal Property, Usury, Debtor and Creditor, Criminal Law; *Religious Law*, and lastly *Ceremonial Law*. The effort of the author might have been of benefit, had he taken time to explain these laws in their relation to one another and perhaps also to modern law. However, he does little more than barely refer to them. Moreover, his book is all but ruined by his adoption of the code divisions of modern destructive critics. His main interest seems to have been to point out to what "code" each law belongs, whether to J, E, C, D, H, or P. He says naively: "Higher Criticism has studied this part of the Old Testament exhaustively and has reached conclusions that are fairly harmonious and generally accepted." His main guide in determining the "codes" is Driver.

MUELLER.

American Law of Charities. By *Carl Zollmann*. 623 pages, 6¼×9¼. Leatherette, \$10.00. (The Bruce Publishing Company, Milwaukee, Wis.) Order from Concordia Publishing House, St. Louis, Mo.

This valuable exposition of the American Law of Charities is worthy of serious study. Its method of presentation is clear. In addition, it is both comprehensive and reliable. The author, who, we are glad to say, is a fellow-Lutheran, has spent much time in tracing the history, development, and scope of the various laws governing charities. His research work has been exhaustive, and he has packed into the 570 pages of his book so much invaluable information on almost inaccessible material that his volume is a real contribution to American Law literature. Moreover, everything has been done to make the book practical and usable. The "Analysis of Chapters," in the forepart of the book, gives a clear and detailed account of the contents of the various chapters. The "Index" constitutes a valuable guide, and the "Table of Cases" aids the law student materially in finding what precedent has established. Below the text are found innumerable references to important court decisions which substantiate the opinions expressed by the writer. The text itself is clear and readily intelligible also to the lay reader. Evidently the author has been a close student of Blackstone, of whom his commentarial remarks reminded us as we perused the pages. But even Blackstone could not have presented the tangled doctrine of *cy-pres* more clearly and forcibly than the writer has done. This book ought to be in the hands of all our pastors who are engaged in our extended mission-work connected with charities. They will soon find that to read Zollmann's book is a delight, and that to study it is an education. We gladly recommend it to all who are interested in the American Law of Charities. Lastly, we give the author credit for emphasizing the ruinous influence of the medieval Church on the political and economic conditions of that time, and partly also of our own time; this in spite of the fact that he is a lecturer on law at Marquette University.

MUELLER.